

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, and 6-11 have been amended, and claims 2, 3, and 5 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, and 6-11 therefore remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully traverses the Office’s rejections and, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, respectfully requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowance.

The amendments are supported by the specification and do not introduce new matter. Support in the written description for “the application from other applications or external resources” can be found on Page 14, lines 15-16. Support for “raises startup and shutdown events” can be found on page 15 lines 6-7. Support for “by sharing a global state across a plurality of pages” can be found on page 20, lines 4-6. Support for “a secure execution environment that defines” can be found on page 30 lines 17-19. Support for “during execution of the application in the secure execution environment” can be found on page 10, lines 1-2.

§101 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Office’s rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, Claims 1, 4, and 6-11 have been amended to recite a computer-readable storage medium, thus obviating the grounds for the rejection. During the above-mentioned interview, Applicant’s representative understood the

Office to agree. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the §101 rejection.

§112 SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance, Claims 1, 4, and 6-11 have been amended to recite a computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon an *application framework* for developing an application, comprising components utilized by software applications. In addition, the "launching the application" limitation has been removed to more clearly recite the subject matter. During the above-mentioned interview, Applicant's representative understood the Office to agree that these amendments would overcome the rejection under § 112. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the §112 rejection.

§103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 6,405,364 (Bowman-Amuah) in view of US Patent Publication Number 2003/0051169 A1 (Sprigg).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended one independent claim, namely claim 1 for the sole purpose of

expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections.

THE CLAIMS

Claim 1 recites a computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon an application framework for developing an application, comprising:

- an application object that isolates the application from other applications or external resources, raises startup and shutdown events for the application, and manages application windows and resources;
- navigation components that provide navigation functionality by sharing a global state across a plurality of pages, journaling, journal extensibility, and structured navigation;
- application lifecycle management components that define how the application is deployed, installed, activated, updated, rolled back, and removed from a computing system;
- a secure execution environment that defines a default set of permissions for the application during execution of the application in the secure execution environment, and if the application requires permissions in addition to the default set of permissions, requiring installation of the application; and
- a component that defines a mechanism that allows the application to access common window properties of a hosting environment in a like manner regardless of whether the hosting environment is a browser or a standalone window environment.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office alleges that Bowman-Amuah in view of Sprigg renders claim 1 obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejection, Applicant has amended this claim as discussed during the interview. Applicant respectfully submits that

Bowman-Amuah in view of Sprigg at least fails to teach or suggest “a component that defines a mechanism that allows the application to access common window properties of a hosting environment in a like manner regardless of whether the hosting environment is a browser or a standalone window environment” as recited in independent claim 1. The Office asserts “objects that provide default behavior (e.g., for menus or windows) ...” (Bowman-Amuah, col. 7 lines 51-52) as Applicant’s “allowing the application to access common window properties regardless of the hosting environment”. The Office commented that “The user can access the default behavior, which is a property, of the window. The system is not concerned with the hosting environment” (March 23, 2007 Office Action, page 7). Applicant respectfully disagrees, and instead submits that “default behavior” is not “allow[ing] the application to access common window properties ... *in a like manner* regardless of whether the hosting environment is a browser or a standalone window environment”. During the above-mentioned interview, Applicant’s representative understood the Office to tentatively agree.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Bowman-Amuah and Sprigg at least fail to teach “a secure execution environment that defines a default set of permissions for the application during execution of the application in the secure execution environment, and if the application requires permissions in addition to the default set of permissions, requiring installation of the application” As recited in independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Sprigg discusses a permission list associated with an application when the application is installed on the device (Sprigg, paragraph 0025). However, Sprigg does not appear to teach or

suggest “a default set of permissions for the application during execution of the application in the secure execution environment” and “permissions in addition to the default set of permissions” as recited in independent claim 1 because Sprigg only teaches one set of permissions, and because Sprigg only teaches one kind of execution. During the above-mentioned interview, Applicant’s representative understood the Office to tentatively agree.

For at least this reason, this claim stands allowable.

Claims 4 and 6-11 depend from claim 1 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 1 apply equally to claims 4 and 6-11. Claims 4 and 6-11 are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach, or suggest. Applicant therefore submits that each of claims 4 and 6-11 stands allowable at least for its dependency upon claim 1.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 4, and 6-11 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to contact the undersigned representative to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/David W. Foster/

Dated: 4/28/2008

David W. Foster (daved@leehayes.com)
Reg. No. 60,902
Christopher Lattin (christopher@leehayes.com)
Registration No. 56,064

Customer No. 22801

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com